## CHITOMOLOGICA AMERICANA

VOL. III.

BROOKLYN, NOVEMBER, 1887.

NO. 8.

## NOTES ON LACHNOSTERNA.

By George H. Horn, M. D.

There is probably no genus of Scarabæidæ in our fauna about which so little is known by the numerous collectors in our country as Lachnosterna. This too in face of the fact that the species are for the most part of large size and abundant whenever found. Unfortunately there are no striking differences between the species which arrest the first glance. A few seem to have met easy recognition and are correctly named in every series examined such as *crenulata*, *hirsuta*, *hirticula*, *micans*, *tristis* and *fusca* although several species are often mixed under the latter name.

It is not surprising that attention has not been given to the species as the literature at present available does not give great assistance, and in my own case there was almost equal difficulty in arriving at a correct determination of the species with the types for comparison along with the literature.

Lachnosterna is certainly one of the most difficult genera in our fauna and the correct determination of the species has been rendered uncertain by the large proportion described from uniques.

For more than twenty years I have had in mind a careful study of the genus and have allowed no opportunity to escape that would add to the material on hand and many a time in the slow accumulation my Lachnosterna boxes have served as a relaxation when other work has been burdensome.

While on a visit to the Museum at Cambridge during the past Summer I had an opportunity through the kindness of the Curator, to compare a selected series from my own cabinet with the types of Dr. LeConte. With this as a basis it became necessary to go over the works of previous authors to verify the determinations and eliminate error as far as possible.

In the present short essay I propose to give the results of my synonymical study, or at least my present determinations, as a closer study when the descriptions are to be written may possibly modify the views here given.

In a paper published by me (Trans. Am. Ent. Soc. '78, p. 137–138) I have shown that Tostegoptera, Eugastra, Endrosa and Gynnis should be united with Lachnosterna. This view I have seen no reason for changing.

Among the species at present in our lists there is some confusion and more synonymy. In order to make the synonymy clear I propose to take the authors by date of seniority.

Froehlich describes fusca and crenulata.

Fabricius describes tristis.

Knoch describes quercus, micans, ilicis, hirticula, hirsuta, pilosi ollis (=tristis) quercina (=fusca).

Gyllenhal describes fervens (=fusca) Knochii and georgicana (=crenulata).

Say describes longitarsis, ephilida, balia and lanceolata.

Harris describes fraterna; Hentz describes porcina (=ilicis).

Melsheimer describes rugosa and pruinosa || (=prunina Lec).

Blanchard (Ent. Mus. Paris) described many species from our fauna and quotes a number of others some erroneously. As many of those species were unknown to Dr. LeConte, it has been thought advisable to condense what is known of them. They are all described as Ancylonycha.

L. profunda Bl. distinct species allied to rugosa and Knochii.

- " brevicollis Bl. a race of fusca.
- " fervida ‡ Bl. is crassissima Bl.
- " puncticollis Bl. probably a good species allied to fusca.
- " fervens ‡ Bl. is congrua Lec.
- " uniformis Bl. is ephilida Say.
- " pruinosa ‡ Bl. is gibbosa Burm. (futilis Lec.)
- " crenulata ‡ Bl. is hirticula,
- " crassissima Bl. subsequently described as obesa Lec.
- " longicornis Bl. I have examined the type but it is doubtful as a member of our fauna, all the other species given by Castelnau are from Brazil.
- " micans ‡ Bl. is prununculina (cerasina Lec.)
- " diffinis Bl. is allied to fraterna, has a very long antennal club and the last ventral of not impressed. It is from South Carolina, M. Sallé informs me, not Texas.

Burmeister (Handbuch 1855) follows with a much greater series, described as Ancylonycha and Trichestes.

- L. quercina Kn. is fusca.
- " fraterna ‡ Burm. I have no doubt that this is prunina Lecfrom which the prulinosity of the surface has been removed by alcohol. By admitting this, some of the following descriptions may be better understood and the species identified.
- L. micans Knoch, correctly identified.
- " cognata Burm, is correctly determined by Leconte.
- " gibbosa Burm. The following remark is added to the description "One of the two specimens before me shows a remarkable anomaly; the ventral segments usually connate are free in their middle convex resembling the appearance of barrel-hoops." By this seemingly unimportant note I have discovered specimens of futilis Lec. which agree as well in the anomaly as in the description.
- L. Forsteri Burm. seems to be that described as lugubris Lec.
- " Knochii Gyll. Burmeister described from the type.
- ", ilicis ‡ Burm. I have specimens which seem to agree and will require a new name.
- L. fimbriata Burm. is the true ilicis Knoch.
- crenulata Fröhl, and hirticula Knoch are correctly determined.
- albina Burm. Known to us but rare.
- " rugosa Mels. correctly determined.
- , comata Burm, is balia Say.
- , quercus Knoch. correctly determined.
- " lanceolata Say, under Tostegoptera, correctly determined.

The following are described as Trichestes.

- L. tristis Fab. correctly determined.
- ", comans Burm. subsequently described as rufiola Lec. determined from a duplicate in Zimmerman's old collection.
- L. crinita Burm. subsequently described as glabripennis Lec.
- " ephilida Say, correctly determined.
- " longitarsis Say, correctly determined by Burm, notwithstanding LeConte's opinion to the contrary,
- L. prununculina Burm. since described as cerasina Lec.
- " gracilis Burm. since described as volvula Lec.
- , dispar Burm. Subsequently described as Gynnis debilis Lec.

The Revision of the Melolonthidæ by Dr. LeConte appeared nearly two years after the work of Burmeister. The species of Lachnosterna were described in part as Eugastra, Endrosa and Gynnis, while Tostegoptera was then suppressed. The following are the species:

- L. ventricosa Lec. with cribrosa Lec. as synonym.
- " quercus Knoch. correctly determined.

- L. vo'vulı Lec. is gracilis Burm.
- " lanceolata Say, correctly determined.
- " *cequalis* and *farcla* Lec. valid species. The first is represented by an unique.
- L. torta Lee, a very distinct species.
- " frontalis Lec. is scarcely a variety of longitarsis Say.
- " dispar Burm incorrectly determined, is clemens Horn.
- " lat frons Lec. a good species.
- " cerasina Lec. is prununculina Burm.
- " ephilid i Siy, correctly determined.
- " Burmeisteri Lec. a smaller race of ephilida. The name was given under the supposition that Burmeister had incorrectly determined longitarsis Say,
- L. glaberrima Bl. correctly determined.
  - " inana Lec. is the same as volvula and is gracilis Burm.
- " congrua Lec. a valid species.
- " futilis Lec. is gibbosa Burm.
- " fusca Fröhl. correctly determined.
- " cephalica Lec. very closely allied to fusca.
- " decidua Lec. is comans Burm.
- " sororia Lec. is a composite species, the Q type is a micans the Q is comans Burm.
- L. micans Knoch, correctly determined,
  - " serricornis Lec. is the ♀ of futilis and is gibbosa Burm.
  - " semicribrata Lec. a mere variety of lugubris.
- " lugubris Lec. without much doubt Forsteri Burm.
- " cognata Burm. correctly determined.
- " fraterna Harr. correctly determined.
- " lutescens Lec. a slight variety of lugubris.
- " corrosa Lec. a valid species.
- " calceata and marginalis Lec. valid species.
- " *obesa* Lec. is crassissima Bl.
- " prunina Lec. (for pruinosa || Mels.) a good species.
- " rugosa Mels. correctly determined.
- " affinis Lee. a good species.
- " Knochii Gyll. correctly determined.
- " ilicis Knoch, correctly determined.
- " ciliala Lec. possibly a race of ilicis.
- " subtonsa Lec. is ilicis Burm.
- " hirticula Kn. and hirsuta Kn. correctly determined.
- " balia Say, correctly determined.
- " vilifrons Lec. a good species.

- L. hirtheps Lec. does not differ from vilifrons.
- " nitita Lec. Of this I have seen two Q specimens, while possibly a valid species it may be an anomalous fusca.
- L. rufiola Lec. is comans Burm.
  - " robusta Lec. is crassissima Bl.
- " integra Lec. This name is preoccupied, clypeata is suggested instead.
- " crenulata Fröhl. and albina Burm. correctly determined.
- " parvidens Lec. and rubiginosa Lec. valid species.
- " submucida Lec. and glabricula Lec. valid species.
- " glabripennis Lec. is crinita Burm.
- " tristis Fab. correctly determined.
- " crinita ! Lec. is a race of tristis Fab.
- " debilis Lec. (Gynnis,) is dispar Burm.
- " errans Lec. a valid species.
- " maculicollis Lec. and nitidula Lec. are good species and constitute a special division.

A few other species have been described but these do not affect synonymy and are left for a fuller bibliography.

From what precedes it may be scarcely necessary to say that my work on a monograph of the species has fairly begun and has progressed so far that the species are well separated and the synoptic tables prepared subject to such modification as may be found necessary when descriptions are written.

While I must frankly admit that I do care to be interrupted in the work of writing descriptions of about eighty species, I am perfectly willing to return the names to any one who will send carefully compared duplicates of any species, preferably both sexes. I cannot at present consent to receive any which must be returned.

## Some Additional Synonymy.

Agrilus texanas Crotch, on comparison this species proves to be cavata Chev.

Cymatodera fallax Horn, is balleata Lec. My error resulted from an accidental change of label in the Leconte collection.

Trox foveicollis Har., is insularis Chev.